Thesis/
Reports
Ward,
T. J.

PILOT STUDY FOR ESTABLISHING AND EVALUATING THE UTILITY OF SIMULATED RAINFALL IN ESTIMATING RUNOFF AND EROSION PROCESSES

Timothy J. Ward

AD-33 Bookplate
(1-48)

U. S. FOREST SERVICE

FT. COLLINS

NATIONAL

AGRICULTURAL

LIBRARY

LIBRARY COPY
ROCKY MT. FOREST & RANGE
EXPERIMENT STATION

78

PILOT STUDY FOR ESTABLISHING AND EVALUATING THE UTILITY OF SIMULATED RAINFALL IN ESTIMATING RUNOFF AND EROSION PROCESSES

by

Timothy J. Ward
Professor
Department of Civil Engineering
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

TECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT

Project No. 1423672

June 1986

New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute

in cooperation with

Department of Civil Engineering
New Mexico State University

The research on which this report is based was financed in part by the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service through the New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute.

Project Number: Cooperative Agreement 28-C2-269.

LIBRARY COPY
ROCKY MT. FOREST & RANGE
EXPERIMENT STATION

DISCLAIMER

The purpose of Water Resources Research Institute technical reports is to provide a timely outlet for research results obtained on projects supported in whole or in part by the institute. Through these reports, we are promoting the free exchange of information and ideas and hope to stimulate thoughtful discussion and action that may lead to resolution of water problems. The WRRI, through peer review of draft reports, attempts to substantiate the accuracy of information contained in its reports, but the views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the WRRI or its reviewers.

Contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the United States Department of the Interior, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute their endorsement by the United States Government.

ABSTRACT

Estimation of runoff and sediment yield from small, ungaged watersheds is a difficult hydrologic task. Process oriented mathematical models can be an important part in the solution of this task. Models, however, require some information which is directly related to the hydrologic processes occurring on the watershed. Rainfall simulation is an important experimental technique for gathering such information.

This technical report contains the results of a pilot study on the utility of using rainfall simulation in southwestern watersheds. Two different simulators were compared on three sites in New Mexico. A small area, 10 square feet, and a large area, approximately 2000 square feet, were operated for a total of sixty plot experiments. The large simulator was modified and operated with variable intensity rainfall and with overland flow without rainfall for some of the experiments.

Analysis of the data indicates that the simulators provide similar results for hydrologic processes, but that sediment yields are lower from the large simulator. Addition of the variable intensity and overland flow capabilities to the large simulator have provided a means for isolating and studying those two important processes.

Rainfall simulation is an important experimental technique for hydrologists. Properly applied, rainfall simulation can provide high quality and important information on watershed processes.

Keywords: computer models*, data collection*, hydrologic models, hydrologic processes, infiltration, parametric hydrology, runoff plot, sediment yield, simulated rainfall, soil erosion*, watersheds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	x
INTRODUCTION	1
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	2
SCOPE OF REPORT	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
METHODOLOGY	6
LOCATION OF SITES	6
SAMPLES	6
SIMULATOR EXPERIMENTS	7
Large Simulator	7
General	7
Artificial rainfall	8
Topography	10
Runoff measurements	10
Sediment and water quality samples	10
Vegetation and ground cover	10
Soil samples	11
Overland flow velocity	11

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Flow visualization	12
Laboratory measurements	12
Small Simulator	13
Field sampling	13
Laboratory measurements	16
SIMULATOR TESTS AND COMPARISONS	17
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	19
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	19
CONSTANT RATE RAINFALL	24
Large Plot Hydrographs	24
Water discharge	30
Infiltration rate	30
Sediment concentration	31
Sediment yield	32
COMPARISON OF PARAMETERS	32
Infiltration Parameters	32
Erosion Parameters	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
VARIABLE RAINFALL RATE AND OVERLAND FLOW	38
Runoff and Sediment Yield	39
Water discharge.	39
Sediment concentrations.	40
Comparison of Experiments	40
OVERLAND FLOW RATES.	43
SUMMARY.	45
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	48
FIGURES	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
1	Plot Characteristics Small Area Simulator.	20
2	Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S) of Plot Characteristics for Small Area Rainfall Simulator. .	22
3	Plot Characteristics for Large Area Simulator. . . .	22
4	Storm Characteristics Small Area Simulator	25
5	Infiltration and Erosion Small Area Simulator. . . .	27
6	Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S) of Simulated Storm Results for Small Area Rainfall Simulator. . .	29
7	Simulated Storm Results for Large Area Simulator . .	29
8	Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S) for Selected Infiltration Parameters.	35
9	Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S) for Selected Sediment Yield Parameters.	37
10	Runoff Characteristics for the VIR and OLF Experiments.	41
11	Sediment Yields (suspended) from the VIR and OLF Experiments.	42
12	Flow Resistance Determined from Overland Flow Experiments.	44

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
1	Location map of ARS watersheds and NMSU (Las Cruces) sites.	52
2a	Topographic map of WS2.	53
2b	Relief projection of WS2.	54
3a	Topographic map of WS3.	55
3b	Relief projection of WS3.	56
4a	Topographic map of NMSU	57
4b	Relief projection of NMSU	58
5	Discharge and sediment concentration for WS2-Dry experiment.	59
6	Discharge and sediment concentration for WS2-Wet experiment.	60
7	Discharge and sediment concentration for WS3-Dry experiment.	61
8	Discharge and sediment concentration for WS3-Wet experiment.	62
9	Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU-Dry experiment.	63
10	Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU-Wet experiment.	64
11	Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU-Variable Intensity Rainfall (VIR)-Dry experiment.	65
12	Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU-Variable Intensity Rainfall (VIR)-Wet experiment.	66

TABLE OF FIGURES (Continued)

Figure	Title	Page
13	Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU-Overland Flow (OLF)-Dry experiment.	67
14	Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU-Overland Flow (OLF)-Wet experiment.	68

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to several individuals who made this report possible.

Drs. Leonard De Bano, Malchus Baker, and L. Dave Garrett of the USDA Forest Service, Tempe and Flagstaff, Arizona, recognized the usefulness of rainfall simulation for studying hydrologic processes. Larry Schmidt and Rhey Solomon of the USDA Forest Service Regional Office in Albuquerque, New Mexico, were of invaluable assistance in the work on the ARS watersheds.

The field crew was headed by Andy Seiger and included James Castillo, Vince Chavez, Bert Griswald, Clay Howard, and Hugh Kelly. Andy was also responsible for data processing after the experiments. His dedication to the project is greatly appreciated.

Preparation of the final report involved Lydia Madrid who did the rough typing; Susan Bolin, and Randy Foltz who worked hard to reduce data, prepare graphics, and edit the text; finally, Carolyn Laman-Lundie and Carol Kunkel who assisted in report assembly.

INTRODUCTION

Three small abandoned USDA-ARS watersheds located north and west of Albuquerque, New Mexico, have been designated as target watersheds for further study of rainfall-runoff modeling. Personnel of the Region 3 office of the USDA Forest Service requested assistance in characterizing the infiltration and erosion parameters for these watersheds. Current watershed models neglect the importance of channel infiltration in the runoff cycle of arid and semiarid watersheds. Therefore, channel losses are lumped into infiltration or routing parameters. If more information is known about upland infiltration, then it becomes easier to delineate the influence of channel losses when models are used to simulate measured rainfall-runoff events. One technique available for deriving infiltration parameters, rainfall simulation, also lends itself to studying soil erosion. In this study, infiltration and erosion parameters were derived from data collected with rainfall simulation techniques. The derived parameters will be useful in further attempts to test models on the target watersheds.

This pilot study also tested the applicability of the rainfall simulation technique for data collection. Data will be used to demonstrate and evaluate the use of simulated rainfall and to help characterize the hydrologic processes on the target watersheds. Two types of simulators were used, a large area simulator (up to 370 square meters) and a small area simulator (1 square

meter). Infiltration and erosion parameters were derived from both types of simulators and compared to study scale factors or other differences between runoff and erosion data collected with the simulators. In addition, modifications to the large simulator were tested on an area of the NMSU campus.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

There are two goals that were identified for this study. These were to:

A. Use data and observations collected with the simulators to help characterize infiltration, runoff, and erosion processes for the target watersheds.

B. Demonstrate the applicability of rainfall simulation for studying runoff processes in a southwestern environment.

These two major goals were subdivided into seven objectives related to the simulation device or the field studies. These objectives were:

A. Site Studies

1. Characterize infiltration parameters on at least two soils.
2. Characterize soil erosion parameters on the same soils.
3. Collect water and sediment chemistry samples for chemical analyses by the USDA Forest Service.

4. Relate site and soil characteristics to the infiltration and erosion parameters derived in objectives 1 and 2 above.

B. Testing of Device

1. Modify and test variable intensity capabilities of the larger rainfall simulator.
2. Develop and test an overland flow generating device.
3. Compare infiltration and erosion measurements collected using the large simulator with those collected using the small simulator.

SCOPE OF REPORT

This report is a summary and analysis of rainfall-runoff and erosion data collected from two target watersheds and from a site on the NMSU campus using large and small simulators. Data collection methods and techniques were previously presented in the study plan and are reiterated in this report. This final report includes analyses of the data as related to the goals and objectives of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Considerable advances have been made in recent years in our understanding of the generation of storm runoff. A number of models are now available to describe mechanisms that produce runoff from precipitation. Briefly, these mechanisms include (1)

Hortonian overland flow, where rainfall rate exceeds the infiltration rate of the soil and the precipitation excess flows over the ground surface; (2) saturated overland flow from "partial source area," in which high water tables cause saturation of small areas of a watershed, often near stream channels, and generate overland flow; (3) subsurface flow of infiltrated water moving laterally through the soil mantle toward the channel system; and (4) expansion of the channel system during storms to tap subsurface flow systems and permit overland flow from "variable source areas." Dunne (1978) has provided a review of these mechanisms.

In the study area, Hortonian overland flow is the primary mechanism because infiltration rates are low and rainfall rates are high. With this constraint, the primary factors that were considered were infiltration parameters. Of particular interest to the Regional personnel are those parameters used in the RAIN model (Solomon 1983), specifically those parameters which are used in the Horton (194Ø), Philip (Jaynes and Gifford 1981) and Green and Ampt (Mein and Larson 1973) infiltration equations. This information can be derived from rainfall-runoff experiments (for example, see USDA-ARS 1979, numerous articles).

A benefit of using rainfall simulation to determine infiltration parameters is that measurements can be taken for estimating soil erosion parameters. Erosion parameters can be subdivided as those related to raindrop splash and to overland

flow (e.g., Knisel 1980). The specific parameters in this study were those used in models developed at Colorado State University (e.g., Simons, Li and Ward 1977). Techniques for derivation of these parameters have been discussed by Ward and Seiger (1983 and 1985) for data collected with the small simulator.

A question arises, however, as to whether or not parameters derived from different rainfall simulation devices are the same. Such a comparison has not been published to this writer's knowledge. This study makes such a comparison.

METHODOLOGY

LOCATIONS OF SITES

The two watersheds selected for tests are located in the Bernabee M. Montano Grant of the Laguna Indian Reservation. They are located at about 35 11' 23" north latitude and 107 01' 30" west longitude on the Herrera, New Mexico USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle. The watersheds lie at elevations between 5900 and 6100 feet. Watershed II(2) covers an area of 40.5 acres and Watershed III(3) is larger at 176 acres. Soils in both watersheds are predominantly fine sandy loams (>60%) with clay loams occurring near channels and as residual soils on shaley bedrock. Because of the predominance and accessibility of the fine sandy loams, these soils were selected for study. These soils are typically less than 18 inches deep and overlay interlayed sandstone, shale and gypsum.

Because the soils composing both watersheds were similar, a different soil was included for testing at a site on the campus of New Mexico State University in Las Cruces. The site is west of Interstate 25, east of the football stadium and south of University Avenue. The elevation at the site is about 4000 feet. The soil is old alluvium composed primarily of sands and gravels.

SAMPLES

One large simulator and 8 to 10 small simulator plots were subjected to simulated rainfall and/or overland flow at each of the three sites. The small plots on the watersheds were sampled

during the period August 7-10, 1984. Subsequently, between August 19 and 22 the large plots were sampled. For the NMSU site, the small plots were sampled between October 8 and 13, and the large plot on October 29 and 30. Time constraints and the cost of hauling water prevented testing of variable intensity rainfall and the overland flow device at the remote sites. These tests were conducted at the NMSU site on May 19, 1985. The two variable intensity rainfall simulations and two overland flow simulation experiments were conducted.

SIMULATOR EXPERIMENTS

Large Simulator

General. The large plots, were approximately 60 feet long by 30 feet wide with an iron plot frames penetrating the soil approximately four inches deep to form a boundary. Surface flow was directed off the plot with a sheet metal trough. Overland flow was measured with cut-throat flume and water level recorder. Suspended sediment in samples of runoff water were collected for determination of soil erosion. Additional samples of runoff were collected for chemical analyses by the USDA Forest Service. Site conditions such as surface soil characteristics, flow patterns, soil texture, topography, and vegetation cover were also measured. Site selection was important as it is necessary to have reasonable access for the water truck.

Two simulations per plot were conducted with two others applied at the NMSU site.

The two primary simulations are:

1. Dry run - single intensity rainfall.

2. Wet run - single intensity rainfall.

The two secondary simulations are:

3. Variable intensity rainfall - dry and wet run.

4. Saturated run - overland flow water discharge only.

Simulations 3 and 4 required modifications to the simulator equipment.

Artificial rainfall. The large rainfall simulator consists of Rainjet 78 C sprinklers mounted on top of 10 foot tall standpipes so that the individual water drops will attain near terminal velocities. Water is supplied from a tank truck via a 215 gpm pump powered by a 30 HP engine. Flow is regulated by in-line flow valves on each standpipe. A valve (or flow regulator) will deliver seven gpm to the sprinkler head when water enters with a pressure of between about 30 to 100 psi. The standpipes are placed in five parallel rows and arranged in equilateral triangles to produce overlapping systems of approximately one and two-inch per hour intensities. By controlling the one-inch per hour system, it was possible to create a variable intensity rainfall. Maximum total coverage for the system is about 4,000 square feet.

The large rainfall simulator has been modified from one originally built at Colorado State University (Holland, 1969). Instead of pressure regulators in the original design, flow regulators have been substituted to allow for less system adjustment and more reliability. The original design was determined to deliver approximately 40 percent of the kinetic energy that would occur from a natural rainfall of the same intensity. The present system has been tested to determine the energy delivered and results indicate 55 percent delivery of energy. Ward (1985) compared sediment yields generated with this simulator with natural rainfall and a simulator that delivers about 56 percent of the energy. No significant differences in sediment (or water) yield were found between the application methods. Even if the energy is not the same, there are appropriate correction methods available to adjust yields.

The fourth type of simulation involved overland water flow only. The pump and pipe system were modified to measure inflow rates, with an in-line flow meter, to a 30 foot long perforated (3/8" holes) diffusing pipe that was located at the top edge of the plot. Water entering the diffusing pipe was distributed across the plot and then flowed downslope to the collection point. This simulation allowed easier viewing of overland flow and was used to investigate overland flow conditions.

Topography. Topography of each site was surveyed on approximately 1-by-1 meter grid system. Maps of each site were prepared showing the location of the raingages and sprinkler standpipes. The topographic maps were digitized and plotted using computer aided graphics.

Runoff measurements. Runoff water was collected at the lower end of each runoff plot. A plot frame placed to a depth of approximately four inches was installed at each site to help define the boundary.

All data are referenced to the initiation of the artificial rainfall or overland flow. The runoff rate was measured with a water level recorder on a cut-throat flume.

Sediment and water quality samples. Water samples were collected for analysis of the suspended sediment concentration at intervals of 30 seconds to two minutes. The sediment samples were filtered and the filters dried and weighed to determine the amount of sediment. Bed load sediment was minimal but was collected from depositions in the approach flume, dried and weighted. Water samples collected at the beginning, middle, and end of runoff were supplied to the Tempe work unit for chemical analyses.

Vegetation and ground cover. Two techniques were used to estimate vegetation and ground cover on the large plots. First, the vegetation and ground cover were estimated by visual inspection and by the field crew members (checked in the office

with photographs). Second, a minimum of ten transect lines perpendicular to the flow direction were sampled using a line intercept method. At these "intercepts", the surface cover type, grass, brush, rock, or bare soil, was noted. If a rill was at the point, that too was recorded. The observations and measurements provided reasonable estimates of actual cover.

Soil samples. Surface soil cores were collected from the outside edge of the large plots immediately before and after a run. These were measured for soil moisture content. A minimum of four cores were collected each time. Three bulk samples, each approximately 1 kilogram in weight were randomly sampled from the plot after the final simulation. One sample was collected in each third, top middle and bottom, of the plot. In addition, other samples were collected from the small simulator and were used to check on spatial homogeneity of the plot samples.

Overland flow velocity. Determination of overland flow velocities on natural surfaces under simulated (and actual) rainfalls is a difficult task. On forest roads, a colored dye has been used, but is difficult to trace because of dispersion and dilution (Eric Sundberg, U.S. Forest Service, Moscow, Idaho personal communication). Earl Neff (personal communication, retired from the USDA-ARS in Sydney, Montana) has used salt slug tracers and electrical conductivity measurements of the outflow water to determine the travel times of the overland flow. In this study, a "time-of-concentration" technique was investigated

whereby the average overland flow rate was calculated with the time elapsed from introduction of the water via the diffusing pipe to the time hydrograph reaches equilibrium.

Flow visualization. Dye was introduced as a line or point source at various points in each plot and the stringers of dye left behind, as concentrated flow advances downslope more rapidly than the general sheet of water, were photographed. The dye was reinforced as needed to detect new concentrations as they form downslope.

Laboratory measurements. Once the data sheets and field samples were returned to New Mexico State University, they were measured and analyzed for several basic data including:

1. Rainfall depth and duration.
2. Total runoff and runoff hydrograph.
3. Suspended sediment yield and sediment hydrograph.
4. Bed load sediment yield.
5. Final infiltration rate.
6. Infiltration parameters.
7. Soil moisture and porosity.
8. Depth to wetted front.
9. Soil particle size distribution.
10. Percent and type of cover.
11. Erosion parameters.

Suspended sediment was filtered following procedures for fine sediments as discussed in USGS (1977). Bed load was dried

and weighed. Cover was estimated by two methods and was checked from photographs. Soil moisture was measured as found in USGS (1977). Soil gradation is determiend on a split sample following ASTM specifications D421-58 and D422-63. Bulk density was found from oven dried weights of measured cores. Rainfall rates were determined by the gage readings. Runoff rate was determined from the water level recordings. Infiltration and erosion parameters were derived from the measured and the processed data as discussed in following sections.

Small Simulator

Field sampling. Data were collected using a modified Purdue simulator (Bertrand and Parr 1961) mounted on sixteen foot long trailer. A pair of nozzles is mounted on two separate booms, one boom on either side of the trailer. At each parking spot it is possible to simultaneously collect two samples from the one square meter target shape with one side drive flush with the soil surface. That side is where runoff exits the plot, enters a collection trough and is sampled. This simulator delivers an average intensity of approximately 3.5 in/hr rainfall intensity to the plot with 2.5 psi inlet pressure to the nozzle. Pressure variations change the intensity. Applied energy to the plot is approximately 56% of that expected from natural rainfall (Wischmeir and Smith 1978), as determined by flour pan studies conducted by Andy Seiger (unpublished data). Water is delivered simultaneously to both booms by a pump and water tank mounted on

the trailer. First a dry run, then a wet run, was conducted as described by the following sequence.

DRY RUN

1. Select site and fill in general information on sample (data) sheet.
2. Initially position one square meter plot frames.
3. Position trailer carrying rainfall simulator so that it covers the plots as desired.
4. Install plot frames with trench for collection trough.
5. Seal disturbed edges of soil with bentonite.
6. Take pictures of the plots and estimate cover.
7. Connect suction pumps to troughs.
8. Collect soil moisture and density samples from top ten cm of surface in the 1" I.D. sampling tube. Collect on outside edge of plot frame. Put in soil cans, label and seal.
9. Place impervious rainfall collection cover on plot.
10. Install raingages.
11. Install wind screens as needed.
12. Begin rainfall.
13. Sample rainfall rate using runoff from impervious cover.
14. Remove cover.
15. Note times of ponding and runoff into the trough.

16. Pump troughs as necessary (every three to five minutes).

17. Record pumped volume and save sample in barrel.

18. Rain for approximately 45 minutes to assure a steady-state runoff.

19. Replace cover and again sample rainfall rate.

20. Stop rain and pump trough a final time.

21. Measure depths in barrels.

22. Agitate barrels and collect two samples 500 ml of water and sediment, one of USDA Forest Service analyses. Preserve one with 10 ml of chlorine bleach in a one quart glass jar, labelled and sealed.

23. Remove deposited material (bed load) from runoff trough and runoff tray (metal flume between plot and trough). Bag material in plastic ziploc bags and label.

24. Record raingage depths in inches and millimeters.

25. Measure depth to wetted front on outside edge of plot.

26. Cover plot with plastic sheet, plywood, and dirt until wet run.

WET RUN (12 to 24 hours later)

27. Repeat steps 6 to 25 above except rain for a minimum of 20 minutes or until steady runoff is observed.

28. Measure slope in plot with a Brunton compass.

29. Remove about 1 kilogram of soil for sieve analyses from the center of the plot.

Samples of water, sediment, and soil are transferred along with sample sheets.

Laboratory measurements. Similar procedures as listed for the large simulator data were used with the small simulator data. Exceptions are that sediment load was analyzed using a composite runoff sample and hydrographs were not developed.

DERIVATION OF PARAMETERS

Selected parameters were derived from the data. These parameters were derived via statistical techniques or model filtering techniques. With model filtering techniques, rainfall-runoff processes (or only overland flow) would be simulated and matched to the data by adjusting (or optimizing) the key model parameters. For infiltration, the key model parameters are steady-state infiltration rate and a soil moisture parameter such as capillary suction. These values can be determined from appropriate data analysis techniques using model components.

Erosion on overland flow surfaces comes about when there is sufficient energy to dislodge and move the soil materials. The two sources of energy present in simulator studies are from raindrop impact and overland flow. Raindrop impact does work by dislodging particles and transporting them relatively short distances in splash water. In the absence of overland flow, splash is an inefficient transport mechanism. Overland flow, particularly sheet and rill flow, typically has lower energy but is more efficient at transporting sediment. In combination the

two energy inputs provide an effective method of soil erosion. It is usually difficult to precisely separate the two processes when analyzing soil erosion data (Kinnel 1985). Instead, a balance between the two is found by analyzing data from different rainfall intensity and overland flow rate experiments. This is a primary reason for conducting a series of experiments on a site.

For surface erosion, the key parameters are raindrop splash detachment and overland flow detachment coefficients. These parameters can also be determined using model components (Ward and Seiger 1983). However, they are not the only ones affecting the erosion processes. In addition, there are the smaller surface roughness elements, vegetative covering, soil size distribution, and the concentration of runoff. These were quantified so as to provide numeric data for comparative purposes.

SIMULATOR TESTS AND COMPARISONS

Data from the two simulators were compared to define the relationship between the two approaches with respect to depiciting infiltration and erosion. Descriptive statistics were employed whenever possible. Derived information is used to depict site response in common terms which can be applied to future modeling efforts and to help in establishing future experimental designs.

An important part of this study was the demonstration of rainfall simulation in helping to define site/watershed response

to water inputs. This techniques is important in an era of shrinking budgets and declining numbers of personnel.

RESULTS AND ANALYSES

Data collected from the large and small simulator experiments were reduced, analyzed and summarized. The results of these efforts are presented in following sections. The results are then used to provide evidence for the applicability/usefulness of simulation and for extraction of model parameters.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Tables 1 and 2 list individual and summarized site measurements for the small simulator plots. Means and standard deviations were determined for the small plot experiments. There was only one large simulator plot at each location. The summarized data for the large simulator are presented in Table 3. Most information in these tables is self-explanatory. Gradation pertains to a bulk soil sample. Gravel percent is the average percent by weight larger than 4.75 mm in diameter. Sand represents the size fraction between 4.75 mm and Ø.Ø75 mm, and fines are less than Ø.Ø75 mm in size. Wet and dry AMC's are the antecedent moisture contents on a dry weight basis sampled just prior to the rainfall application. Topographic maps and 3-D projections were prepared for each large watershed plot and are presented in Figures 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b for WS2, WS3, and NMSU sites, respectively. These computer generated figures provide an overall feeling for the relative uniformity, with localized exceptions, on the plots.

Table 1

Plot Characteristics Small Area Simulator

PLOT ID	AMC (%)	SLOPE (%)	POROS (%)	COVER ROCK (%)	COVER VEG (%)	GRADATION GRAVEL (%)	GRADATION SAND (%)	GRADATION FINE (%)
WS2 -L -D1	7.1	3.0	51.9	3.0	15.0	.5	61.2	38.3
WS2 -L -D2	6.3	5.2	51.0	.0	30.0	.0	65.2	34.8
WS2 -L -D3	6.9	6.2	55.0	3.0	20.0	.2	61.8	38.0
WS2 -L -D4	7.2	8.9	52.4	2.0	10.0	.4	60.4	39.2
WS2 -L -W1	14.3	3.0	51.9	3.0	15.0	.5	61.2	38.3
WS2 -L -W2	14.1	5.2	51.0	.0	30.0	.0	65.2	34.8
WS2 -L -W3	16.2	6.2	55.0	3.0	20.0	.2	61.8	38.0
WS2 -L -W4	18.6	8.9	52.4	2.0	10.0	.4	60.4	39.2
WS2 -U -D1	8.0	10.8	58.2	2.0	20.0	.0	42.2	57.8
WS2 -U -D2	6.4	13.3	56.3	1.0	40.0	.0	64.8	35.2
WS2 -U -D3	7.9	10.7	55.5	2.0	25.0	.0	43.1	56.9
WS2 -U -D4	8.3	8.6	60.3	1.0	25.0	.0	59.9	40.1
WS2 -U -W1	18.3	10.8	58.2	2.0	20.0	.0	42.2	57.8
WS2 -U -W2	13.5	13.3	56.3	1.0	40.0	.0	64.8	35.2
WS2 -U -W3	19.3	10.7	55.5	2.0	25.0	.0	43.1	56.9
WS2 -U -W4	15.2	8.6	60.3	1.0	25.0	.0	59.9	40.1
WS3 -L -D1	8.6	5.6	54.4	.0	25.0	.0	51.1	48.9
WS3 -L -D2	11.8	8.5	61.8	.0	20.0	.0	34.0	66.0
WS3 -L -D3	11.0	5.7	60.1	.0	13.0	1.8	43.8	54.4
WS3 -L -D4	7.5	3.9	56.4	.0	10.0	.3	52.5	47.2
WS3 -L -W1	14.9	5.6	54.4	.0	25.0	.0	51.1	48.9
WS3 -L -W2	27.8	8.5	61.8	.0	20.0	.0	34.0	66.0
WS3 -L -W3	21.6	5.7	60.1	.0	13.0	1.8	43.8	54.4
WS3 -L -W4	17.1	3.9	56.4	.0	10.0	.3	52.5	47.2
WS3 -U -D1	16.2	9.1	67.9	.0	7.0	.0	8.8	91.2
WS3 -U -D2	15.0	10.7	62.0	.0	1.0	1.7	22.4	75.9
WS3 -U -D5	10.5	9.1	54.8	1.0	12.0	11.1	26.9	62.0
WS3 -U -D6	13.5	21.1	62.3	.0	20.0	.0	11.5	88.5
WS3 -U -W1	24.1	9.1	67.9	.0	7.0	.0	8.8	91.2
WS3 -U -W2	22.2	10.7	62.0	.0	1.0	1.7	22.4	75.9
WS3 -U -W3	22.0	15.3	60.1	.0	.0	.0	21.2	78.8
WS3 -U -W4	22.4	15.9	56.4	.0	5.0	.0	13.5	86.5

TABLE 1 CONTINUED

NMSU-N -D1	3.2	2.6	37.2	40.0	3.0	13.3	65.0	21.7
NMSU-N -D2	2.6	4.4	46.1	40.0	3.0	13.0	65.5	21.5
NMSU-N -W1	8.7	2.6	37.2	40.0	3.0	13.3	65.0	21.7
NMSU-N -W2	9.2	4.4	46.1	40.0	3.0	13.0	65.5	21.5
NMSU-S -D1	2.6	4.4	53.7	40.0	3.0	21.8	67.2	11.0
NMSU-S -D2	3.4	4.1	43.1	30.0	8.0	20.1	64.1	15.8
NMSU-S -W1	8.2	4.4	53.7	40.0	3.0	21.8	67.2	11.0
NMSU-S -W2	8.3	4.1	43.1	30.0	8.0	20.1	64.1	15.8
NMSU-E -D1	2.3	4.4	46.8	30.0	1.0	9.6	69.7	20.7
NMSU-E -D2	2.4	3.9	45.3	35.0	16.0	12.7	64.9	22.4
NMSU-E -W1	7.5	4.4	46.8	30.0	1.0	9.6	69.7	20.7
NMSU-E -W2	10.7	3.9	45.3	35.0	16.0	12.7	64.9	22.4
NMSU-W -D1	1.2	5.5	40.0	30.0	3.0	19.8	54.8	25.4
NMSU-W -D2	2.0	4.5	42.6	30.0	7.0	19.7	63.3	17.0
NMSU-W -W1	8.2	5.5	40.0	30.0	3.0	19.8	54.8	25.4
NMSU-W -W2	10.1	4.5	42.6	30.0	7.0	19.7	63.3	17.0
NMSU-N2-D1	1.6	2.9	42.8	30.0	4.0	17.5	64.9	17.6
NMSU-N2-D2	2.6	3.5	40.1	60.0	1.0	23.1	59.5	17.4

Comparisons of the small and large simulator plot characteristics indicate that most site measures are not different between the two. Notable exceptions are found on the WS3 plots where measured porosity is signficantly higher on the small plots relative to the large plots. Vegetative cover was significantly lower on the small plots. There was a big difference between the sand and fine fractions. For the small plots there was twice as much fines as sand, but the ratio was reversed for the large plots. Reexamination of the data for the individual plots shows that differences are caused by a large variation in soil characteristics in the plot area. Both WS2 and

Table 2

Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S) of Plot Characteristics for Small Area Rainfall Simulator

						COVER				GRADATION									
		POROSITY (%)		SLOPE (%)		ROCK (%)		VEG (%)		GRAVEL (%)		SAND (%)		FINES (%)		DRY AMC (%)		WET AMC (%)	
	N	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S
WS2	8	55.	3.	8.3	3.3	2.	1.	23.	9.	Ø.1	Ø.2	57.3	8.9	42.5	9.Ø	7.3	Ø.7	16.2	2.3
WS3	8	6Ø.	4.	9.3	4.7	Ø.	Ø.	12.	8.	1.2	2.8	67.7	16.4	31.1	16.5	11.8	3.Ø	21.5	4.Ø
NMSU	9	44.	5.	4.1	Ø.8	36.	8.	5.	4.	16.7	4.5	64.1	4.1	19.2	4.2	2.4	Ø.7	8.9	1.1

Table 3

Plot Characteristics for Large Area Simulator
(The AMC values are for the constant rainfall experiments only)

	AREA (SQ.FT.)	POROSITY (%)	SLOPE (%)	VEG COVER (%)	GRAVEL (%)	SAND (%)	FINES (%)	DRY AMC (%)	WET AMC (%)
WS2	2173.	5Ø.	7.56	25.67	Ø.ØØ	55.73	44.27	3.35	17.91
WS3	17Ø8.	49.	9.17	21.76	Ø.23	61.36	38.41	3.98	12.76
NMSU	2Ø23.	45.	3.47	12.3Ø	16.Ø2	68.15	15.83	5.66	9.22

WS3 have higher proportions of fines near the upper (U) end of the big simulator plots and lower proportions near the lower end (L). One of the three samples taken from the large simulator had a very low content of fines which tends to skew the composited sample somewhat. A subsequent field visit in April, 1984, confirmed this suspicion. Therefore, it appears that the differences in the gradations is caused by natural variations in the soil coupled with the random selection of plots and samples.

The differences in vegetation cover are attributable to the fact that there is an inherent tendency to place the small plots where vegetation is sparse (easier to install) and the fact that the small plots are a point sample while the large plot was sampled by a line intercept. (Note that rock cover, although present, was not explicitly sampled along the line intercepts used for the large plots). The differences in porosity are more difficult to explain. It appears that the average small plot porosity is consistently higher for both WS2 and WS3. This may reflect a sampling/measurement error, but there is no confirmation of errors in the data books. Again this may be related to the natural soil variability as found in the gradation comparisons.

Differences in plot characteristics, if they are not artifacts of the sampling/measurement system, should affect rainfall-runoff erosion processes. These comparisons are made in the following sections.

CONSTANT RATE RAINFALL

Individual plot measurements are presented in Tables 4 and 5 for the three sites. Tables 6 and 7 list the summarized results of the simulated constant rate rainfall experiments. Notable differences between measurements for the two types of simulators are seen in rainfall rate, rainfall depth, runoff depth, and runoff to rainfall ratio (RO/RF). There are also differences between the sites for the same type of simulator, and, as expected, differences between dry and wet runs. Some of these differences are caused by operational characteristics of the simulators. However, there do seem to be some points of similarity. In most cases, the final infiltration rates of the small simulator plots compare very well to the rates found by analysis of the large plot runoff hydrographs.

Large Plot Hydrographs

All the stage recordings from the large plot simulations were digitized, converted to discharge, smoothed using a three-point (nearest neighbor) moving average and replotted with the corresponding sediment concentration values. The six hydrographs for the constant rainfall simulations are presented in Figures 5,6,7,8,9, and 10 for the WS2 dry, WS2 wet, WS3 dry, WS3 wet, NMSU dry and NMSU wet experiments.

The hydrographs have all been plotted to the same time and discharge scales. Sediment concentration scales vary because concentration had extreme fluctuations which are important to

Table 4

Storm Characteristics Small Area Simulator

PLOT ID	RAINFALL RATE (IPH)	RAINFALL EVENT (MIN)	RAINFALL DEPTH (IN)	RUNOFF EVENT (MIN)	RUNOFF DEPTH (IN)	RO / RF
WS2 -L -D1	4.62	27.Ø	2.Ø8	25.8	1.4Ø	.67
WS2 -L -D2	4.64	28.Ø	2.17	26.Ø	1.14	.53
WS2 -L -D3	5.3Ø	23.Ø	2.Ø3	22.4	1.23	.61
WS2 -L -D4	4.19	29.3	2.Ø4	28.Ø	1.53	.75
WS2 -L -W1	5.26	24.Ø	2.11	23.6	1.6Ø	.76
WS2 -L -W2	4.36	2Ø.4	1.49	2Ø.Ø	1.1Ø	.74
WS2 -L -W3	5.32	2Ø.5	1.82	2Ø.2	1.43	.79
WS2 -L -W4	3.8Ø	24.4	1.55	24.Ø	1.18	.76
WS2 -U -D1	5.Ø6	34.Ø	2.87	32.5	1.97	.69
WS2 -U -D2	4.78	35.4	2.83	34.Ø	1.81	.64
WS2 -U -D3	4.88	34.Ø	2.77	33.Ø	1.98	.72
WS2 -U -D4	4.47	36.5	2.72	34.Ø	1.63	.6Ø
WS2 -U -W1	5.53	25.5	2.35	25.3	1.9Ø	.81
WS2 -U -W2	4.55	24.3	1.84	24.Ø	1.59	.86
WS2 -U -W3	4.59	22.Ø	1.68	21.6	1.37	.82
WS2 -U -W4	4.Ø1	24.5	1.64	24.Ø	1.26	.77
WS3 -L -D1	3.56	3Ø.Ø	1.78	27.7	.97	.55
WS3 -L -D2	3.25	36.Ø	1.95	33.9	1.2Ø	.62
WS3 -L -D3	3.92	19.Ø	1.24	17.8	.68	.55
WS3 -L -D4	4.21	28.6	2.ØØ	26.Ø	1.27	.63
WS3 -L -W1	4.65	2Ø.Ø	1.55	18.9	1.26	.81
WS3 -L -W2	4.24	22.5	1.59	22.2	1.32	.83
WS3 -L -W3	5.41	25.Ø	2.25	24.4	1.71	.76
WS3 -L -W4	3.39	23.2	1.31	22.4	.93	.71
WS3 -U -D1	3.2Ø	34.5	1.84	32.9	1.11	.61
WS3 -U -D2	3.82	35.2	2.24	33.8	1.52	.68
WS3 -U -D5	4.75	34.Ø	2.69	33.1	2.Ø7	.77
WS3 -U -D6	4.57	31.3	2.38	3Ø.Ø	1.62	.68
WS3 -U -W1	4.29	2Ø.Ø	1.43	19.7	1.29	.9Ø
WS3 -U -W2	4.45	22.3	1.66	22.Ø	1.31	.79
WS3 -U -W3	4.2Ø	19.Ø	1.33	18.2	1.Ø8	.81
WS3 -U -W4	4.Ø4	22.7	1.53	22.Ø	1.14	.75

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

NMSU-N -D1	4.25	46.6	3.30	45.2	1.92	.58
NMSU-N -D2	3.38	51.4	2.90	48.2	1.51	.52
NMSU-N -W1	4.49	45.7	3.43	44.9	2.10	.61
NMSU-N -W2	4.45	30.0	2.23	29.3	1.76	.79
NMSU-S -D1	2.42	37.0	1.50	33.1	.73	.49
NMSU-S -D2	3.87	42.0	2.71	39.4	1.05	.39
NMSU-S -W1	3.76	34.0	2.13	32.6	1.47	.69
NMSU-S -W2	3.54	31.0	1.83	29.7	1.13	.62
NMSU-E -D1	3.85	43.0	2.76	40.2	1.23	.44
NMSU-E -D2	3.66	42.0	2.56	39.4	1.17	.46
NMSU-E -W1	3.24	26.0	1.40	25.4	.96	.69
NMSU-E -W2	3.39	24.5	1.39	23.6	.92	.67
NMSU-W -D1	3.46	37.5	2.16	36.2	1.02	.47
NMSU-W -D2	4.18	34.5	2.41	32.7	1.51	.63
NMSU-W -W1	3.92	40.0	2.61	39.4	1.79	.68
NMSU-W -W2	3.69	31.0	1.90	29.9	1.29	.68
NMSU-N2-D1	3.54	41.0	2.42	38.9	1.24	.51
NMSU-N2-D2	4.17	36.1	2.50	34.5	1.56	.62

Table 5

Infiltration and Erosion Small Area Simulator

PLOT ID	INFILTRATION		EROSION		
	FINAL RATE (IPH)	FRONT DEPTH (IN)	SUSP YIELD (GMS)	BED YIELD (GMS)	TOTAL YIELD (T/A.IN)
WS2 -L -D1	1.11	4.7	106.8	194.0	1.02
WS2 -L -D2	1.49	9.1	60.9	261.0	1.33
WS2 -L -D3	1.55	3.9	168.1	514.0	2.62
WS2 -L -D4	.48	6.3	121.1	848.0	2.98
WS2 -L -W1	1.07	****	138.6	252.0	1.16
WS2 -L -W2	.86	****	60.7	281.0	1.47
WS2 -L -W3	.98	****	303.3	346.0	2.14
WS2 -L -W4	.22	****	76.2	461.0	2.15
WS2 -U -D1	.96	5.5	307.5	449.0	1.81
WS2 -U -D2	1.24	5.5	220.9	894.0	2.91
WS2 -U -D3	.79	4.3	288.5	840.0	2.70
WS2 -U -D4	1.00	5.1	117.4	139.0	.74
WS2 -U -W1	.93	4.3	262.5	587.0	2.12
WS2 -U -W2	.63	5.9	159.0	663.0	2.45
WS2 -U -W3	.68	****	119.8	424.0	1.87
WS2 -U -W4	.55	****	72.2	160.0	.87
WS3 -L -D1	1.15	7.3	83.6	119.0	.99
WS3 -L -D2	1.07	5.7	307.9	253.0	2.20
WS3 -L -D3	1.48	5.1	99.6	165.0	1.85
WS3 -L -D4	.79	5.3	161.3	23.0	.69
WS3 -L -W1	.36	5.9	174.5	.0	.66
WS3 -L -W2	.53	4.3	259.6	244.0	1.80
WS3 -L -W3	1.23	6.7	339.0	157.0	1.37
WS3 -L -W4	.49	7.9	104.2	32.0	.69
WS3 -U -D1	.82	4.3	277.8	745.0	4.34
WS3 -U -D2	.87	5.4	404.8	638.0	3.25
WS3 -U -D5	.62	5.5	1085.7	1008.0	4.78
WS3 -U -D6	.76	8.7	805.0	1028.0	5.35
WS3 -U -W1	.25	5.5	636.5	347.0	3.60
WS3 -U -W2	.70	5.5	143.9	555.0	2.53
WS3 -U -W3	.43	6.5	144.0	524.0	2.92
WS3 -U -W4	.64	6.5	201.5	640.0	3.47

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

NMSU-N -D1	1.41	13.Ø	41.8	82.Ø	.31
NMSU-N -D2	.48	13.Ø	36.5	11.Ø	.15
NMSU-N -W1	1.34	12.6	29.7	157.Ø	.42
NMSU-N -W2	.73	12.6	11.8	48.Ø	.16
NMSU-S -D1	1.Ø2	5.5	130.6	51.Ø	1.17
NMSU-S -D2	1.94	11.Ø	16.3	1Ø.Ø	.12
NMSU-S -W1	.85	11.Ø	18.3	15.Ø	.11
NMSU-S -W2	.91	12.6	18.1	15.Ø	.14
NMSU-E -D1	1.32	8.8	42.3	135.Ø	.68
NMSU-E -D2	1.45	7.3	34.5	123.Ø	.64
NMSU-E -W1	1.26	12.Ø	4Ø.2	78.Ø	.58
NMSU-E -W2	1.24	11.Ø	191.1	89.Ø	1.43
NMSU-W -D1	1.65	4.9	1Ø.5	115.Ø	.58
NMSU-W -D2	.96	9.Ø	21.8	152.Ø	.54
NMSU-W -W1	.93	9.4	16.3	161.Ø	.47
NMSU-W -W2	.89	11.Ø	11.7	94.Ø	.39
NMSU-N2-D1	1.15	11.9	11.3	44.Ø	.21
NMSU-N2-D2	.91	9.8	73.9	146.Ø	.67

**** wetting front depth not distinct

Table 6

Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S) of Simulated Storm Results for Small Area Rainfall Simulator

		N	FINAL INFILT (iph) M	FINAL INFILT (iph) S	SUSP YIELD (gms) M	SUSP YIELD (gms) S	BED YIELD (gms) M	BED YIELD (gms) S	TOTAL YIELD (T/Ac.in) M	TOTAL YIELD (T/Ac.in) S	RAIN RATE (iph) M	RAIN RATE (iph) S	DEPTH RAIN (inch) M	DEPTH RAIN (inch) S	DEPTH RUNOFF (inch) M	DEPTH RUNOFF (inch) S	RO/RF (dim) M	RO/RF (dim) S
WS2	D	8	1.08	0.35	173.9	89.8	517.4	310.2	2.01	0.90	4.74	0.35	2.44	0.39	1.59	0.32	0.65	0.07
	W	8	0.74	0.28	149.0	90.0	396.8	171.1	1.78	0.55	4.68	0.63	1.81	0.29	1.43	0.26	0.79	0.04
WS3	D	8	0.95	0.28	403.2	359.0	497.4	407.4	2.93	1.77	3.91	0.57	2.01	0.44	1.30	0.43	0.64	0.07
	W	8	0.58	0.30	250.4	172.9	312.4	244.1	2.13	1.17	4.33	0.57	1.58	0.30	1.25	0.23	0.80	0.06
NMSU	D	10	1.28	0.45	41.9	36.5	86.9	54.7	0.51	0.32	3.68	0.54	2.52	0.48	1.29	0.34	0.51	0.08
	W	8	1.02	0.23	42.1	60.5	82.1	58.8	0.46	0.43	3.81	0.46	2.11	0.69	1.43	0.43	0.68	0.06

Table 7

Simulated Storm Results for Large Area Simulator
(Results for the constant rainfall experiments only)

		DURATION (mins)	APPROX. FINAL INFIL. (iph)	SUSP YIELD (lbs)	BED YIELD (lbs)	TOTAL YIELD (T/Ac.in.)	RAIN RATE (iph)	RAIN DEPTH (inch)	RUNOFF DEPTH (inch)	RO/RF (dim)
WS2	DRY	27.0	1.08	18.7	4.8	0.56	2.33	1.05	0.42	0.40
	WET	16.4	0.63	31.3	6.5	0.82	2.60	0.71	0.46	0.65
WS3	DRY	29.8	0.82	41.8	0.9	1.05	2.52	1.24	0.50	0.40
	WET	27.2	0.03*	147.5	5.0	1.80	2.85	1.29	1.08	0.82
NMSU	DRY	16.4	1.56	4.1	0.7	0.19	3.00	0.82	0.27	0.33
	WET	22.4	0.87	6.4	1.3	0.13	3.05	1.14	0.66	0.58

* This value is too low because of the derivation technique used.
An adjusted value of 0.28 iph may be more realistic.

visualize. The concentration scales for the NMSU experiments are the same, however.

Water discharge. The hydrographs reflect many effects of the natural and human controlled system. Although each hydrograph reaches a "somewhat" steady rate of runoff, there are fluctuations and trends in the rate. Infiltration theory suggests that there should be a slow increase in the crest limb with time. This is apparent for the WS2 and WS3 experiments. The slowly increasing runoff rate is in response to the infiltration rate approaching a constant value, as suggested by serveral rational algebraic approaches to modeling infiltration. Fluctuations on the crest limb are related to wind (WS2 wet is a good example of wind blowing rain off the plot), equipment (the stage recorder is very good but very sensitive to changes in flow depth), and the "constant" rate does vary slightly as evidenced by rainfall weighing gage charts), and natural processes (infiltration fluctuates with time and location). In general, the hydrographs are acceptable and can readily be used for other analyses.

Infiltration rate. One analysis is to determine the steady state infiltration rate for the constant rainfall experiments. This was done by averaging the three highest runoff rates on the crest limb (not the rising or recession limbs) then subtracting that average from the constant rainfall rate. The resultant "infiltration rate" is listed in Table 7. Other methods can be

used. However, this technique is one that the author has applied in rainfall-runoff modeling to provide a good, first estimate of the infiltration rate. It should be noted that this technique produces a very low rate for WS3-wet which may be a result of rainfall, not infiltration, fluctuations. If the steady rate values occurring before the recession limb are used, a more reasonable infiltration rate can be calculated. Comparison of the rates with those from the small plots are made in another section.

Sediment concentration. Sediment concentration grab samples were periodically collected and subsequently analyzed. The concentration time plots are interesting in that they reflect different processes occuring on the different sites. WS2 shows the classic concentration decay with time, then a "surprising" increase towards the end of the crest limb. The decay is caused by the finer materials quickly washing off the plot while the rise is attrituted to coarser materials (or other source areas) reaching the outflow. The high values on the recession limb of WS2-wet indicate this effect. As the flow drops the amount of material is the same, therefore, the concentration increases. This "jump" during the recession limb is evident on the other plots also. The WS3 experiments don't exhibit the decay as seen on WS2. The increase with time is evident as a larger volume of material reaches the flume. Concentrations for NMSU plots rise initially then decrease. This is reasonable as the larger

material on the NMSU site are less prone to transport. This causes an initial "flush off" of the fine materials then a decay as less and less material reaches the flume. It is obvious, then, that each site responds differently from the others with respect to sediment production.

Sediment yield. Sediment yields were determined for each experiment. Suspended yield, that material in transport through the flume, was computed by three different methods, all of which produced equivalent answers. The values reported in Table 7 were found by interpolating the hydrograph and concentration values on one-minute intervals, multiplying, and summing. Applications of a conversion factor produced suspended yield in pounds. Sediment that was deposited in the approach though, "bed load", was removed and weighed separately after the experiments. The amount of bed load at the WS2 and WS3 sites is some indication of the material that was moving through the system at a slower rate, as compared to the NMSU site.

COMPARISON OF PARAMETERS

The site characteristics and runoff measurements most useful in modeling are infiltration parameters, sediment production parameters, soil porosity, and antecedent moisture content.

Infiltration Parameters

Because of its growing popularity, infiltration parameters were derived from the small plot data for the Green-Ampt (G-A)

infiltration equation. Four parameters are needed in this equation: soil porosity, initial soil moisture content, hydraulic conductivity in the wetting (infiltrating) front, and capillary (suction) head across the wetted front. Soil porosity and initial soil moisture have already been presented and are not repeated here. Instead two sets of derived values for the hydraulic conductivity and suction head are presented. Conversion of the G-A parameters to those used in other equations is possible with the information provided here (Rawls and Brakenziek, 1985).

Two methods were used to derive the G-A parameters. The first method (used by Ward and Seiger, 1983) involves fitting a straight line to the data pairs of instantaneous infiltration rate and the reciprical of infiltrated water depth or:

$$f = a + \frac{b}{F} \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\

An approximation to ds is

$$ds = (1-Si) = 1 - \frac{AMC\ (1 - n)\ 2.65}{n} \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots (3)$$

where Si is the initial soil saturation, AMC is the antecedent soil moisture (decimal fraction) (see Table 1), and n is the soil porosity (Table 1).

For the soil conditions encountered, dS varied between about Ø.2Ø and Ø.8Ø, wet and dry, respectively.

The second technique was formally presented by Bach, Wierenga, and Ward (1985) in an application to the Phillip infiltration equation. Sometimes the data points do not contain values of F that are relatively large (as is the case in most simulator experiments). It is therefore possible to obtain negative values of a, hence Kw and Hc. To avoid this, the following technique was applied. The last three steady state runoff rates were averaged to find a steady or final infiltration rate (Table 5) or fr. It is then assumed that Kw = fr, and using Equation 1:

$$\frac{(f - 1)}{fr} = \frac{C}{F} \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots (4)$$

where C is now the "no-intercept" slope, and the other variables are defined previously. The best fit parameter C can be used to find Hc as

$$Hc = \frac{C}{(dS)\ (N)} \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots (5)$$

with all variables defined previously.

The results of these techniques are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S)
for Selected Infiltration Parameters

	FINAL INFIL. (iph)		CAPIL. SUC. (inch)		G-A INFIL. (iph)		G-A SUCTION (inch)	
SITE ID	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S
WS2-D	1.08	0.35	0.40	0.19	0.34	0.30	2.52	2.77
WS2-W	0.74	0.28	0.16	0.21	0.83	0.16	0.51	0.77
WS3-D	0.95	0.28	0.46	0.42	0.51	0.33	1.40	0.59
WS3-W	0.58	0.30	0.35	0.36	0.29	0.23	1.40	1.24
NMSU-D	1.28	0.45	0.92	1.54	0.91	0.50	2.31	1.78
NMSU-W	1.02	0.23	0.29	0.22	0.80	0.49	2.07	1.90

NOTE: Final infiltration is found from the last three steady state runoff measurements.
Capillary suction is derived from the runoff measurements using the final infiltration rate as the assumed Green-Ampt hydraulic conductivy (G-A infiltration) in the wetted front.
G-A infiltration and G-A suction are found by fitting a straight line to data pairs of instantaneous infiltration rate and the recipricol of cumulative infiltration.

The approach using Equation 1 tended to fit the data better (as it should). The infiltration rates, final and G-A, are similar at the WS2 plots, both dry and wet. They differ at the other plots. Capillary heads are inversely related to infiltration rates (mathematically and physically) and are usually quite variable. The heads at the WS3 plots, dry and wet, are surprisingly close. In general, there should be a decrease in capillary head with increasing moisture content, which appears to occur. The NMSU plots tended to have a higher infiltration

rate, and, surprisingly, a higher capillary (suction) head. As a final comparison, information from Rawls, Brakenziek, and Miller (1983) was used. Their data indicate that the Kw values for the soils in the watershed (sandy loams and clay loams) should range between Ø.ØØ8 and Ø.86 inches per hour. The capillary heads should range between 4.33 and 8.22 inches. The Kw values in Table 8 exceed those suggested while the Hc values are much lower. This is expected because the data used by Rawls, Brakenziek and Miller was from laboratory tests and not simulator experiments. This fact alone should have a bearing on the comparison.

Erosion Parameters

Erosion parameters can be divided into those related to rainfall detachment and those related to overland flow. For the smaller plots, overland flow erosion is minimal, but splash erosion is important. One parameter that is important is the splash detachment coefficient (Ward et. al., 1983) This coefficient is found from

$$Yr = (SC)\, I^2 \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\

summarized in Table 9 for suspended and bed load (not suspended) sediment yields. Note that the coefficients are additive to find total yield coefficient. These values compare well with a compilation by Ward et. al., (1983) where values (for the Southwest) ranged between about Ø.1Ø and Ø.5Ø. Again it is obvious that WS3 produces sediment at a much higher rate than the other two sites.

Table 9

Means (M) and Standard Deviations (S)
For Selected Sediment Yield Parameters

	SUSP. YIELD (tons/Ac.)		SUSP. COEF. *		BED YIELD (tons/Ac.)		BED COEF. *	
SITE ID	M	S	M	S	M	S	M	S
WS2-D	Ø.82	Ø.42	Ø.1Ø	Ø.Ø4	2.45	1.47	Ø.3Ø	Ø.19
WS2-W	Ø.7Ø	Ø.43	Ø.11	Ø.Ø5	1.88	Ø.81	Ø.32	Ø.16
WS3-D	1.91	1.7Ø	Ø.25	Ø.15	2.35	1.93	Ø.33	Ø.23
WS3-W	1.18	Ø.82	Ø.2Ø	Ø.14	1.69	1.Ø7	Ø.28	Ø.19
NMSU-D	Ø.2Ø	Ø.18	Ø.Ø6	Ø.11	Ø.4Ø	Ø.26	Ø.Ø8	Ø.Ø5
NMSU-W	Ø.2Ø	Ø.29	Ø.Ø7	Ø.14	Ø.39	Ø.27	Ø.Ø9	Ø.Ø6

* - The coefficient values are derived from the yield and runoff data. The working equation is

$$Y = a I^2$$

where Y is yield rate in tons/Ac.(bare area)/runoff duration,
a is the coefficient as listed above, and
I is rainfall rate in inches per hour.
The derived units on the coefficients are tons-hr/Ac.-sq. in.

The above comparisons of selected parameters indicate that the simulators can be used to differentiate between sites, derive parameters, and produce parameters that are comparable to other studies. The large simulator is capable of other functions in addition to constant rainfall rate experiments.

VARIABLE RAINFALL RATE AND OVERLAND FLOW

Modifications were made to the large simulator equipment to produce variable intensity rainfall (VIR) and overland flow (OLF). The VIR set up required that the piping system be valved with high quality, rapid open-close butterfly valves. The OLF set up required a 30 foot long - 4 inch diameter PVC pipe with 3/8" holes drilled on one foot centers. The pipe diffuser was connected directly to the pump with an inline flow meter. The diffuser pipe also had a piezometer tube which was calibrated in the lab over a range in flow rates.

In operation, the VIR set up could be rapidly changed (less than 10 seconds) between 1, 2, and 3 inch per hour sprinkler patterns. The OLF set up was placed at the top of the plot with the holes pointing directly up to minimize erosion. Pressure to the diffuser was regulated at the pump. These two modifications were tested on the NMSU site in May of 1984. Both performed quite well. The following sections present the results of the experiments using the VIR and OLF modification.

Runoff and Sediment Yield

The experiments were conducted in sequence as: VIR-Dry, OLF-dry, VIR-wet, and OLF-wet. Obviously after the VIR-dry experiment, everything was wet, however, there was a lapse of about five hours before the OLF-dry experiment was conducted. The VIR-wet was conducted about ninety minutes later, followed by the OLF-wet after one hour. Final clean up was done with flashlights. The VIR-dry was run in four rainfall intensity steps, 3-2-1-2 inches per hour (theoretical rates). The OLF-dry was run at a low flow rate then increased to a higher rate. The VIR-wet stepped at 3-2-1 inches per hours, and the OLF-wet also went from a low flow rate to a high flow rate. Sediment samples were taken for these experiments as they were for the constant rainfall rate experiments. The discharge-concentration-time plots are shown in Figures 11, 12, 13 and 14 for the VIR-dry, OLF-dry, VIR-wet, and OLF-wet experiments. The discharge values have been smoothed using a 3-point moving average.

Water discharge. Discharge rates for the VIR experiments showed good response to changes in rainfall rate. The changes are apparent on the hydrographs, particularly on the VIR-wet graph (Figure 16). The slowly rising crest limb is evident in all the hydrographs, as discussed earlier for the constant rainfall rate hydrographs. Note that the VIR and OLF hydrographs have longer durations than the constant rainfall rate hydrographs, reflecting the acquisition of a water truck between

experiments. Perturbations on the hydrographs were minimal thanks to a more experienced crew, only one equipment mishap (kinked hose) on the OLF-wet experiment, and cooperative weather. The hydrographs truely reflect the input changes from the equipment.

Sediment concentrations. Sediment concentrations behaved as noted before in the constant rainfall rate experiments. There is a rise then decline in concentration for the VIR experiments. There is also an increase in the concentration on the falling limb (VIR-wet), and a big jump on VIR-dry when a 2 inch per hour burst is applied at the end of the experiment. Similar jumps can be seen on the OLF hydrographs when the flow rates are increased. Interestingly, the concentrations for the OLF experiments exhibit a decay during each constant rate, rather than an increase then decrease as seen in the VIR experiments.

Comparison of experiments

It appears that there is a distinct difference between the processes taking place in the VIR and OLF experiments. Summaries of the experiment results are listed in Table 10. As with the constant rate rainfall experiments, the theoretical rain rates are not necessarily always achieved. However, the results are very consistent. The calculated final infiltration rates are in line with those presented in Tables 6 and 7 for this site, confirming the contention that infiltration rate can consistently

Table 10

Runoff Characteristic for the VIR and OLF Experiments

Experiment	Duration (mins)	Rain Rate (iph)	Rain Depth (inch)	Runoff Depth (RO) (inch)	Runoff Rate (iph)	Infilt Rate (iph)	RO/RF (dim)	AMC (%)
NMSU-VIR D	18.55	2.91			1.61	1.30		
	7.02	1.70			1.07	0.67		
	15.80	0.77			0.06	0.71		
	1.82	1.52			0.16	1.36*		
			1.35	0.54			0.40	4.4
NSMU-VIR W	13.25	3.00			2.04	0.96		
	7.33	1.96			1.43	0.56		
	10.50	0.96			0.44	0.52		
			1.07	0.62			0.58	10.2
NMSU-OLF D	25.58	2.39**			1.76	0.63		
	11.40	3.76			3.00	0.76		
			1.73	1.12			0.65	
NMSU-OLF W	19.67	2.68			2.09	0.59		
	7.60	4.26			3.59	0.67		
			1.42	1.05			0.74	

* Infiltration rate not accurate because runoff was not at a steady state.
** Converted from overland flow application rate of gallons per minute.

be measured with a rainfall simulator regardless of scale and application rate. It is also noteworthy to see that infiltration rate can be calculated from the overland flow experiments to provide comparable results. The infiltration rates decrease with time and tend to reach a steady state.

Sediment yields are also comparable with the previous experiments. The yields are a bit higher because of the increased energy available from the rainfall and overland flow. The suggestion that raindrop splash in concert with overland flow are effective erosion agents is evidenced in Table 11. The normalized yields, in the sequence of the experiments, are Ø.24-Ø.Ø8-Ø.13-Ø.Ø2 tons per acre-in. This shows that the rainfall is an important erosion agent.

In general, the water discharge and sediment yield measurements taken during these experiments are of high quality and reflect the fact that the equipment performed as planned. The results further indicate that rainfall is an important part

Table 11

Sediment Yields (suspended) from the VIR and OLF Experiments

Experiment	Total (ins)	Yield (T/Ac.-in)
NMSU-VIR D	12.2*	Ø.24
NMSU-VIR W	7.2*	Ø.13
NMSU-OLF D	8.2	Ø.Ø8
NMSU-OLF W	2.4	Ø.Ø2

* Suspended load only. No deposits were left in the approach troughs to the flume.

of the experiment, but it does not necessarily need to be of variable intensity as the results from the constant rate rainfall experiments were quite similar in most respects.

OVERLAND FLOW RATES

One purpose of the overland flow experiments (OLF) was to help determine overland flow characteristics related to hydraulic routing. The OLF hydrographs were analyzed to determine the time of concentration for the different flow rates. These "travel times" were then used in a simple equation to find a hydraulic roughness coefficient. The working equation is

$$Kg = C^{3} V^{-3} q^{2} \quad \text{..... (7)}$$

where Kg is an overland flow resistance,
V is average flow velocity
q is unit width discharge, and
C is a constant as determined by

$$C = (8\,(g/v)\,So)^{1/3} \quad \text{..... (8)}$$

where g is the acceleration of gravity,
So is the surface slope of the plot, and
v is the kinematic viscosity of water.

Equation 7 is a kinematic wave substituted into the classic Darcy-Weisbach formulation. The Kg parameter is dimensionless, and it should be a constant for a constant roughness surface.

Each OLF hydrograph was analyzed in four portions. In the first, the first discharge steady state data were used to find the travel time to a marked point on the plot. This first arrival time, with the steady discharge, should give a low

resistance estimate, as the first arrival time really represents a discharge less than steady state. The second portion was a determination of time of concentration at the flume for the first discharge, with the subsequent travel velocity. The third portion was the time of concentration for the second discharge, and the fourth portion was the time of recession for the second discharge. A Kg value was computed at each portion for both hydrographs. The results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Flow Resistance Determined from Overland Flow Experiments

Portion of Flow*	Calculated Resistance Values, Kg for OLF-Dry	OLF-Wet
1	652	271
2	**	1198
3	784	1110
4	1954	1922

* 1- Using travel time of advancing from to a point on the site.
2- Using the time of concentration from the first flow rate.
3- Using the time of concentration from the second flow rate.
4- Using the rescession time of the second flow rate.

** Time of concentration difficult to determine.

Portion 1 Kg values are lower than the rest. This reflects the fact that the assumed discharge is not precise. The Portion 2 values cannot be compared between hydrographs because the

resolution/timing on the OLF-dry graph yielded an unrealistically high value. The Portion 3 values show a drop in Kg which is an effect of relative roughness on the flow, while in Portion 4 there is an increase in Kg as the flow decreases and is attenuated by the roughness. In general, the Kg values computed from the two hydrographs, excluding the obviously erroneous measurements, are very close to one another. It appears then that a value for Kg of about 1500 is reasonable for this site. This value is in line with those presented years ago by Woodhiser (1975), a range of 500-3000 being appropriate. It appears that the overland flow device has a high potential for gathering data that can be used to estimate surface roughness conditions.

SUMMARY

Fifty plot-runs using the small simulator and ten with the big simulator were conducted for this study. A tremendous amount of data was gathered, analyzed, and presented here. The analyses show the site characteristics, how the sites respond to simulated rainfall, how results from the two simulators compare, and the potential of other uses for the large simulator. The data base developed in this study will provide information for further research and analyses.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There were two goals and seven objectives for this study. The first goal was to collect data and use it to characterize the rainfall-runoff-erosion processes on target watersheds. Sixty plot-runs (number of plots times number of experiments on each plot) produced a large amount of data that was used to define site characteristics including slope, cover, soil type, infiltration parameters, and erosion measures. This information will be useful for future hydrologic studies.

The second goal was to demonstrate the applicability of rainfall simulation for studying runoff processes. The volume and high quality of the data prove that simulation is a valuable tool. But there is a qualitative aspect that is not easily conveyed. When the simulator is operating on a large or small plot, one has the unique opportunity to watch the surface runoff and erosion processes up close, in comfort, and at will. These advantages are as important, if not more important than the numbers that are gathered. Dogmatic views of hydrology can quickly be changed by this experience.

The large simulator was modified for this study. It was tested for variable intensity rainfall and overland flow. Both modifications worked extremely well and provided some interesting data.

There are further improvements that can be made in the equipment and field procedure. In the future, it is recommended that:

1) A totalizing flow meter be placed in line downstream of the pump to help better quantify flow rates.

2) The clock gear rate on the weighing bucket raingage be sped up to provide better time resolution.

3) A strip of matting be placed beneath the diffuser pipe overland flow device to help prevent erosion.

4) An electronic data logger be added to the stage recorder apparatus, and

5) A minimum crew of four be available for the large simulator at all times.

In conclusion, this was a worthwhile study that provided a tremendous amount of data and clearly demonstrated the utility of simulated rainfall in estimating runoff and erosion processes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bach, L.B., P.J. Wierenga, and T.J. Ward 1985. Estimation of the Philip infiltration parameters from rainfall simulation data. paper presented at the Pacific Division of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, San Francisco State University, California, June 10-15.

Bertrand, A.R. and J.F. Parr 1961. Design and operation of the Purdue sprinkling infiltrometer. Research Bulletin No. 723, Agricultural Experiment Station, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 9 pages.

Dunne, T. 1978. Field studies of hillslope flow processes. In Hillslope Hydrology. M.J. Kirby, editor. Chapter 7, pp. 227-293. John Wiley, New York.

Holland, M.E. 1969. Colorado State University experimental rainfall runoff facility-design and testing of rainfall systems. Colorado State University Report CER 69-70 MEH21.

Horton, R.E. 1940. An approach towards a physical interpretation of infiltration capacity. Soil Scin. Soc. Am., Proc. 5: 399-417.

Jaynes, R.A. and G.F. Gifford 1981. An in-depth examination of the Philip equation for cataloging infiltration characteristics in rangeland environments. J. of Range Mange., 34(4): 285-296.

Kinnel, P.I.A. 1985. Runoff effects on the efficiency of raindrop kinetic energy in sheet erosion. in Soil Erosion and Conservation (edited by S.A. El-Swaify, W.C. Moldenhaver, and A.K. Lo) selected papers from the International Conference on Soil Erosion and Conservation, Honolulu, Hawaii, January 1983, Soil Conservation Society of America, Ankeny, Iowa, pp 399-405.

Knisel, W.G. (editor) 1980. CREAMS, a field scale model for chemical, runoff and erosion from agricultural management systems. USDA-Science and Education Administration Conservation Report No. 26, 643 pages.

Mein, R.G. and C.L. Larson 1973. Modeling infiltration during a steady rain. Water Resour. Res. 9(2): 384-394.

Rawls, W.J., D.L. Brakenziek, and N. Miller 1983. Green-Ampt infiltration parameters from soils data. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, ASCE 109 (1):62-70, January.

Rawls, W.J. and D.L. Brakenziek 1985. Prediction of soil water properties for hydrologic modeling. Proceedings of the 1985 ASCE Watershed Management Symposium - Watershed Management in the Eighties, pp 293-299, Denver, Colorado, April 30 and May 1.

Simons, D.B., R.M. Li and T.J. Ward 1977. Simple procedural method for estimating on-site soil erosion. Colorado State University Report CER76-77DBS-RML-TJW38, Ft. Collins, Colorado, 55 pages.

Solomon, R. 1983. RAIN-runoff analysis for impovement needs. Unpublished manuscript. USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region, April.

U.S. Department of Agriculture-Science and Education Administration SEA) 1979. Proceedings of the rainfall simulator workshop, Tucson, Arizona. Agriculture Review Manual ARM-W-10/July, 185 pages.

United States Geological Survey (USGS) 1977. National handbook of recommended methods of water-data acquisition. Office of Water Data Coordination, Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

Ward, T.J., G.V. Sabol, A.D. Seiger, and L.M. Coons 1983. Rainfall simulation for estimating parameters in a soil erosion model, the New Mexican experience. poster paper presented at the International Conference on Soil Erosion and Conservation, Honolulu, Hawaii, January, 23 pages.

Ward, T.J., and A.D. Seiger 1983. Infiltration tests at Pinon Canyon, Colorado prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, New Mexico State University Engineering Research Center Report, September, 36 pages.

Ward, T.J. and A.D. Seiger 1985. Adaptation and application of a surface erosion model for New Mexico forest roadways, New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute Report, No. 188, June, 83 pages.

Ward, T.J., 1985. Sediment yield modeling of roadways in Soil Erosion and Conservation (edited by S.A. El-Swaify, W.C. Moldenhaver, and A.K. Lo) selected papers from the International Conference on Soil Erosion and Conservation, Honolulu, Hawaii, January 1983, Soil Conservation Society of America, Ankeny, Iowa, pp188-199.

Woolhiser, D.A. 1975. Simulation of unsteady overland flow. in Unsteady Flow in Open Channels, edited by K. Mahmood and V. Yevjevich, Water Resources Publications, Fort Collins, Colorado, pp 485-508.

FIGURES



Figure 1. Location map of ARS watersheds and NMSU (Las Cruces) sites.



Figure 2a. Topographic map of WS2.



Figure 2b. Relief projection of WS2.



Figure 3a. Topographic map of WS3.



Figure 3b. Relief projection of WS3.



Topography of NMSU Watershed Plot

10 feet

Figure 4a. Topographic map of NMSU.



Figure 4b. Relief projection of NMSU.



Figure 5. Discharge and sediment concentration for WS2 - Dry experiment.



Figure 6. Discharge and sediment concentration for WS2 - Wet experiment.



Figure 7. Discharge and sediment concentration for WS3 - Dry experiment.



Figure 8. Discharge and sediment concentration for WS3 - Wet experiment.



Figure 9. Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU - Dry experiment.



Figure 10. Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU - Wet experiment.



Figure 11. Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU - Variable Intensity Rainfall (VIR) - Dry experiment.



Figure 12. Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU - Variable Intensity Rainfall (VIR) - Wet experiment.



Figure 13. Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU - Overland Flow (OLF) - Dry experiment.



Figure 13. Discharge and sediment concentration for NMSU - Overland Flow (OLF) - Wet experiment.

LIBRARY COPY
ROCKY MT. FOREST & RANGE
EXPERIMENT STATION